US DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY COMMUNITY MEETING JUNE 14, 1994 - THE PLANTATION

06/14/94

DOE-FN PUBLIC 50 TRANSCRIPT

		5775
1		
2		
3		
4		
5	US DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	
6		
	COMMUNITY MEETING	
7	•	
8	JUNE 14, 1994	•
9	•	
10	THE PLANTATION	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		•
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

see if we can get this show on the road. Good evening. My name is Gary Stegner. I work in 3 Public Affairs in the Department of Energy at Fernald. 5 I would like to thank you all for 6 coming tonight and welcome you here. I see a lot 7 of new faces out here. Before we get into the main 8 part of the program what I wanted to do is introduce our site manager to you Phil Hamric. 10 Phil has been here for awhile. This 11 will be his first community meeting. He wanted to 12 say a few words before things get under way. 13 You'll see by Phil's presence here and his 14 15 acitivity he's definitely committed to public involvement. Phil. 16 MR. HAMRIC: You have to play up and 17 down with the mike I guess for awhile. Well, this 18 looks to me as if we have some good public 19 involvement tonight. Thank you all very much for 20 21 coming. We want your input. We want to answer your questions and get back to you with the 22 material or answers to the questions that we 23 24 couldn't answer.

MR. STEGNER: Good evening, let's

舞 增长 表

we in the Department of Energy are in a full turn of the ship. We're in a change in DOE such as has not been the case since the Manhattan years. It's a big challenge for us to manage to change because it is and does consist of so many sub things that are changing, but that's our job.

We're going from an old set of values to a new set of values which supports clean up of public lands, such as Fernald. And we are committed in that clean up from the outset to get public involvement, public input, not in a finished product, but in a very skeleton, extremely draft product so that we can have the thinking of the public begin in the beginning.

A second big change that we're into in the Department of Energy is how we manage. We've definitely used a traditional sort of military style, very top down, and now we're changing that to put more value on the input of our employees.

We know for sure that they know more about their work space, the work that they're doing than we do. And so when we're organizing the work

当品品等

and when we're implementing the work we need to have our employees fully participating in the major strategies that develop in our work, in our planning from beginning to end.

Management's job has changed into a job of leadership, continuing with the old style of doing business in a business like way, but the leadership aspect simply means that we're paying more attention to the people who work for us.

We're trying to support them better and we're trying to listen to what they're telling us.

So two of the big things that we should have in our program is number one, public involvement, public input, and then use all of our work force in figuring out how we get there.

Again, as I've started we're in a great change in the Department of Energy and it's going to take us awhile to get it right, but we're going to keep working at it until we do.

I would like now to introduce a part of the change in the FERMCO organization. They have put a new person in charge of the work here, his name is Don Ofte and he would like to introduce himself to you, Don.

MR. OFTE: Good evening. I'm Don

Ofte and have been here since March the 7th of this

year and I've likened the experience that I've had

since then to taking a drink from the fire hydrant

during that entire time and it hasn't let up.

. 8

I've met many of you in this room and other places other times, but many of you I have not. And I just want to say that we are totally in support of the initiative that the Department of Energy is undertaking to change the way we have been operating the sites.

Decome a true believer in is the value of early participation by citizen stakeholders in what's going on at our sites. I've been in locations in the Department of Energy where that was not the case.

Where you would come up with a product at the end of a long tour of preparation and then put it out to the body public, and naively expect ovations because of the wonderful job that had been done and of course what you got was no ownership by the people who were going to be most affected by it.

And the next thing you knew lawsuits were being filed, no time is being saved, programs are moving out to the right, and costs were going up. So early involvement, and participation, and buying by the public is not only something that is right to do it's the most efficient way to run a program. So we're here to serve the DOE and serve you.

making the comment that Fernald is not a Department of Energy site. The Department of Energy doesn't really own it. The people that own Fernald are the people who are here, so as stewards of that site for you the owners, Mr. Hamric, and his people, and we at FERMCO are here to try to do what's right every step of the way and I solicit your help. Thank you.

MR. STEGNER: Thank you, Don. Well, let's go to the drill tonight. Go ahead and put up tonight's agenda. There you can see the folks that's been here before it's going to be pretty much the same format as we followed a couple of sessions ago with the breakouts.

We'll start the night with

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

presentations on the clean up status, talk some about waste shipments, do a little bit on strategic and future use planning to sort of set the stage for one of our breakout sessions tonight, and do a little bit on the material release to set the stage for the second breakout session.

Hopefully around 7:30, maybe a little after, we will have the breakout sessions. Half will stay in here and half will go in the room right here. Again, we'll probably after about a half hour stop and you guys will just change.

And after about an hour and 10 minutes we'll take about a 10-minute break following the breakout session. We'll reconvene in here at 8:40 and at that time we'll have the Ohio and US EPA, Citizens Task Force and FRESH comments, and then we'll have questions and answers, so Jack.

MR. CRAIG: Thanks, Gary. What I would like to do tonight is, excuse me, go through a brief introduction of the regulatory process and procedures we're going by here at this site and then give you a little status on clean up activities, both the documentation we're preparing

3 7 3 3

as natural field work that's going on at the site.

This chart that's on the overhead right now is a chart that's on your seat. It kind of gives an overview of where we're at on all of the different operable units at the site. It's kind of hard to read.

what I would like to do is go through each of the operable units in a little bit more detail. Before I do that I would like to explain a little bit about the process we're in now and the remedial investigation feasibility study process.

We actually started this process back in late 1986 when a federal facility compliance agreement was signed between the DOE and US EPA and have been at this process since then.

The process really includes characterization of the site through a number of meetings, review of historical records, actually going out and taking samples, sending the samples to the labs, that process is called the remedial investigation process.

Once an operable unit which is an area of the site we're trying to characterize we have fully characterized that remedial

200000 000008

- 1 investigation report goes to our regulators of US
 2 and Ohio EPA for approval.
- Once that document is approved

 we're -- that kicks off a feasibility study

 process. This is really where we take all the

 different clean up alternatives and we evaluate

 those alternatives against a set of criteria that's

established by EPA.

And this criteria are effectiveness, implementability, cost, protectiveness of human health and the environment. Once that process is completed that report is also sent to the regulators for approval.

And out of that process comes what's called a proposed plan, which is really the recommendation of the clean up alternative for that specific operable unit. And that is the formal process where the public gets involved.

There is a formal comment period on that document and we respond to public comments, and an actual record of decision is submitted and signed by the US EPA. What I would like to do is quickly walk through where we're at on each of the operable units on the site.

operable Unit Number 1, which is the waste pit area, we are through the characterization phase of this operable unit. We submitted an RI report, remedial investigation report, to the EPA.

 \cdot 12

We have received comments on that and we will be shortly resubmitting a report back to them addressing their comments. And hopefully receive approval on that document in the next few months.

We've also submitted a feasibility study proposed plan and that document we received comments on that also, talked to the EPA about that today, and are going to be meeting with them on that soon.

The public comment period, which is actually where we will be taking official public comments on the proposed alternatives for OU1, we will have some time this summer, so you can mark that on your calendar. I think that's on your sheet also.

Operable Unit Number 2, once again we're through the characterization phase. We have submitted a remedial investigation report to the EPA. We have received their comments and we have

resubmitted that report to them. We actually did
that today.

submitted in April also. We are awaiting comments on that. There was a meeting yesterday with EPA in Chicago to discuss that document, so we're well along with OU2. Once again the public comment period on that proposed alternative will be some time this fall.

Feasibility study report was

And Operable Unit 3 I'll talk a little bit more about the interim record of decision in a minute, but we have agreed we have conditional approval by US EPA to -- on what's called interim record of decision which addresses the take down of D&D buildings on-site. I'll talk a little bit about that in a minute.

Operable Unit 4 I have got another detailed slide on that, but we have proposed an alternative for Operable Unit 4 which is the silo material on-site, K-65 silos, that is under public comment right now. We've had 2 requests for extension and that closes on June 19th, this month, and I'll talk a little bit about that in a minute.

Operable Unit 5, once again we're



through the characterization phase. We'll be shortly submitting the remedial investigation report to the EPA and the rest of the schedule is as on the slide there.

Let's talk a little bit about the interim record of decision. And like I said we have received approval on that document from the regulators. The main reason we did this was to accelerate the D&D buildings on-site.

And we estimate that by implementing this interim record of decision we can save approximately \$300 million by accelerating the schedule for D&D by about 4 years, so it's a significant both cost savings and schedule improvement in an innovative way to get work done on-site.

We signed the document. The

Department of Energy signed the document last week

and it was submitted to the regulators. US EPA

hopefully will sign that document and we will have

their conditional approval in about a month.

And following that we have what's called a remedial design, remedial action work plan which really describes how we're going to implement

Spangler Reporting Services

- this document, how we're going to take the
 buildings down that's scheduled for that, which
 we'll be submitting to the regulators 60 days after
 the interim ROD is signed.
- We did have a public meeting on that,

 what's called a roundtable in June to discuss the

 remedial design or remedial action process, and how

 we plan on involving the public throughout that

 process.

actually doing some work in the field now also in conjunction with the documentation we're preparing. The plant on the slide is a project which we're conducting as a circular removal action. This is a project that was approved by Ohio and US EPA to actually do some demolition of facilities on-site. This project is currently scheduled for completion in November of this year.

The next -- the other major activity in Operable Unit 3, which is ongoing right now, is the D&D of Plant 7 also being conducted as a removal action approved by the US and Ohio EPA. What we have here is a before and after picture, that's what we hope it will look like in about 3

months. The schedule currently is that this building will be -- the construction will be complete in November of this year also.

I spoke about Operable Unit 4, which is the first file record of decision that the site will be issuing hopefully later this summer. We did have a public comment period which officially originally ended in April this year.

we had 2 30-day requests for extentions which were granted, one from the local public here at Fernald and one from the citizens advisory board in Nevada. The reason they were commenting on this document was that the proposal was, the proposed plan, proposes to vitrify the residue material in the silos and ship the material to Nevada for disposal, because of that their citizens advisory board is reviewing the proposed plan.

We expect comments from them this week. And following that incorporation of the comments we will be submitting the document to US EPA for final approval. And this is just a picture of the silos themselves.

I just want to close with actually

Spangler Reporting Services

value your comments that's why we're here tonight to listen to your input. We'll be available to answer questions both at the break and if you have questions during the Q and A session we'll do our

6 best to answer those. Thanks.

21.

MR. HANSEN: Hi, my name is Ray
Hansen and I'm going to be very brief. Jack was
suppose to be brief too, but he didn't do that.
And I want to place emphasis on the breakout
session and get your input to our strategic
planning and also our material release program that
we have on-site, but this just gives you an
update.

This is really the materials that we have shipped off-site. Now, in terms of waste shipment that's just part of the waste management program, but you'll hear more about that later, but I just wanted to give you a status on where we stand in our waste shipments.

And really most of those go to Nevada test site, but not all of them. The significant portion about all of this is in May we reached a total of almost 460,000 drum equivalents. And a

2.8.2.3

drum equivalent again is 7.3 cubic feet and that's the totals that we've shipped.

Our goal for this year is 78,000 drum equivalents. FERMCO today assured me that they're going to try to meet that. If we do that we'll come very, very close to a half million drum equivalents shipped off-site, which I think is a significant achievement.

Listed also on there are some other things that we've shipped off-site. For example, we've shipped DEs to Scientific Ecology Group and you can see what the totals are there and I think those are in your passouts, too.

Also important is that we have been shipping off some of our mixed hazardous waste. We shipped off 181 drum equivalents to our toxic incinerator in Oakridge. We also shipped off in this year -- excuse me, that was back in '87, this year we shipped 4,326 drum equivalents to toxic. We still have approximately 10,000 drums of mixed hazardous waste that we have to deal with on-site.

Significant also is that in 1994 we shipped our first materials to a commercial site and that's in our future plans, too. We don't

Spangler Reporting Services

expect to ship everything to Nevada. We will begin using the commercial sites also. And again some of the materials in the products shipped I do want to give you an update on where we stand in the uranium sale.

As you know that's been very complicated by the formulation of the new US energy corporation, but we think that's about to happen, that's the good news. The bad news is that Kajeema, they're the french corporation who is bidding on our waste materials, has, put it in their words, lost one of their facilities.

If they should recover one of their facilities, I don't know what that means, whether it was a mishap or what it was, but they may begin taking our material come June 26th, we'll know for sure then. But there are other people interested in our normal depleted urainium and so we're moving to get all that stuff off-site. And I'll talk to you again about material release. Thank you.

MR. HAMRIC: As the agenda shows we're going to talk about two topics and first I just want to say a few introductory remarks about the first topic which is strategic planning.



One of the shortcomings of the Department of Energy and its predecessor agencies in the past has been strategic planning, such as life cycle solutions, life cycle costs.

We pretty much stayed in pace with the political budgeting process and we just didn't look ahead to see what closure of all of the waste that we had generated in our process was going to look like, and be, and cost. So strategic planning is now a requirement in the department.

We're trying to look ahead as far as we can look. We have meetings on this in April, two days, my -- the people who report directly to me and the Fernald field office, and Don Ofte, and about seven or eight of his senior staff met, and we went over some strategic planning issues which have been talked about internally in both organizations.

We had a pretty frank set of meetings and out of that we came up with a strategic framework and I'll show you basically what the framework looks like. Next please. Now, this may sound a little corny and a little too fundamental, but we want to begin with the end in mind and the

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

end is the final solution to Fernald, whatever that may be.

The vision classically will be a picture that we can put on paper or in our minds of what the Fernald site looks like when we are all through with the clean up enhancement and so forth. The vision that we have so far hasn't been able to come to that kind of a mental picture of a clean-up site.

which you're going to see will be more of a kind of here's how we're going to get there. So the vision is a living thing, it will change as we learn more about the nature of our problem, get the input, and see how we're going to go about solving it, but it does give us a target of where are we going and we'll answer that question as best as we can.

The next thing is how are we going to behave, we stewards of the site, what do we stand for, and that's what we call values. We came up with six values which we believe we want to attain in our every day working posture with our workers, and with the community, and with everybody with whom we work and meet and discuss. You'll get to

. 3

see those values also.

We defined the mission, actually the mission had been defined some time earlier, probably near a year ago. We thought it was a pretty good definition. We tweaked it some and so you'll see that.

Now, when we talk about a strategy what we really mean is a strategy as the way we get there to the vision. It's what we need to get done and how do we need to do it. And so we came up in brainstorming a whole list of elements of a strategy and we selected I believe eight of those to develop for our initial round of development of a strategy.

eight. And I won't say too much about these except to reiterate the point that this is a start. This is only a first step. There are eight elements that are described in our draft strategic plan in our plant and there are more elements in this that will be developed as time goes on.

You can see that safety is at the very top and that's our safety and your safety. So with that as an introduction to the strategic

planning part Ray will come back and talk about
material disposition or have you done that?

MR. HANSEN: No. As I mentioned before in the past I have given you status on waste shipments. We're really talking about what we call legacy waste. We're getting to the point now where we're going to eventually have some RODs and we're going to deal with much, much more waste.

And we have a program basically that deals with this waste. And all of it, I think we all recognize, cannot be shipped off-site and certainly Nevada, the State of Nevada, is making noise about our shipping all our waste to Nevada.

So we're really looking at what do we do in terms of our waste. And this kind of determines or gives you an outline of what we intend to do. First place if you can minimize the waste you can generate you don't have to worry about disposition. And we have a waste disposition program at the site.

Our intent is to recycle where economically feasible and that means to present to the board and they say to recycle. What we're trying do is rather than take all this stuff and

bury it and pay for the burial, actually try to recycle it and get it back out into public use.

The subject tonight is material release. Basically we're talking about decontaminating and releasing materials from site. The fourth area is involving volume reduction, that's kind of crushing drums. It also means drying so it would remove the moisture to reduce the volume. It also means in some cases shredding materials to reduce the material that we have to pay for to bury it.

And then the waste we'll have to work with. We're looking at programs in plant to store on-site. If the record of decision so decides we intend to and we mentioned earlier that we're trying to use commercial disposal facilities.

Whether you're aware about there was a DOE order that says we will ship, Fernald, will ship only to Nevada test site. Now, we have gotten one variance from that order. The new order is being written and really didn't have that restriction any more. In the meantime we're trying to get a variance to the order until the final order is approved.

And then finally we will dispose of whatever we need to and we're trying to minimize those total volumes. One of the things that we're going to decontaminate and release these are some of the old furnace retorts basically in a box in which we actually created the uranium material called derby.

This shows -- these are two elements that were really purchased when we were looking to go back into production and increase the site's capacity. These were floor plans for. Those were some other materials released.

And significant in all of the buildings we have on-site there is an awful lot of what you see here, I-beams, and these are the type of things we really want to decontaminate and release.

Now, there is enough other materials on-site, for example, just computers, lockers, old lockers, thin gauge material that are very difficult to decontaminate and we won't even try, but where we can and we think it's recycleable and reuseable we try to decontaminate things, and that's the subject of our break-out session this



evening.

So if you have any questions, please feel free to ask a question. If you don't won't to ask it in public we have comment cards in the back after your breakout session take all your questions and of course we have the question and answer session later we'll talk to you, too. Thank you.

MR. STEGNER: Thank you, Ray. We'll go into the breakout sessions now. Let's have -- it looks like it's pretty well divided, let's have this side stay in here and we'll talk about material release. And folks on this side go into there and we'll talk about strategic planning, future use.

And also we'll try to get back at 8:40. On the chairs are the comment cards if you have some questions about what's presented you can write them on that or ask it in the break-out period or the question and answer period. We'll come get you in about a half hour and change up.

(Off the record.)

MR. STEGNER: We'll open up to the floor. Let me remind you that if you don't want to use the microphone you can give me your questions

Spangler Reporting Services

1 on the three by five cards in the chairs.

And what we'll try to do here during the question and answer session is direct the question to me and I'll try to deflect it to one of our separate men sitting here.

They're not all here tonight so if we cannot answer your question on the spot we'll take your question and give a response back to you within 48 hours is our policy. Before I get started I would like to introduce Cheryl Allen. I would also like to introduce Jim Saric.

He's been working with us at the US

EPA. He's going to be working with me on the

project from now on. He's been involved for the

last year and a half or so with our Interim

Radiation Division helping me review documents and

staying involved with the site such as working with

the task force and some other people, so you'll see

his face a lot.

MR. SARIC: Is this pretty helpful the way they did these formatted sessions for everybody? I know it's really helpful for me being a regulator to come in and hear the opinions, you know. I've been real fortunate being involved with



the task force and hearing people's positions, not only there, but in the formats we've had in these sessions, because there is a lot of issues that I tackle on a day by day with the folks from DOE regarding the, you know, clean-up levels, things of that nature, what are we really trying to do.

There are certain regulatory requirments and guidance documents that we try to impose and make DOE follow and understand these are things that need to be done. And also there is costs we've got to consider and there is consideration regarding what you the people want to be done at this site. So hearing a lot of these opinions really helps out a lot as far as where are we going.

And I guess, you know, one of the things we talked about we've been studying these issues for a long time, for a lot longer than I've been involved here. If you look in the next six months what's happening there is a lot of big decisions that are going to be made that are going to be available.

Between now and Christmas I think

Jack put up some of the information, some of the

Spangler Reporting Services

dates, basically these decisions won't necessarily 1 2 be finalized, but we will get a chance to see what's going to happen or what are the proposed 3 remedies basically for the site as a whole.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

What's going to happen or what is DOE proposing based on documents we've reviewed and all kinds of discussions we have had and from input from the task force, and other citizens, and things like this working in a consensus kind of what they think of the proposed -- alternative proposed remedies for the various operable units.

So it's really coming up in a hurry and hopefully everyone will really stay involved. And I'm really encouraging any comments you've got or ideas you have of what we should do in the future and I'm usually around.

I can be reached in my office. would be glad to give you my phone number if you don't have it. Again, I would like to have your input as we move along. I think it's getting to a critical stage and any input I can have to help strongly influence what the EPA does in the next several months is always appreciated. Thanks.

> MR. STEGNER: Thank you, Jim. Tom

· 13

Schneider.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Good evening, as you know you've got a new face up here talking to you at these meetings from now on. I replaced Graham as the lead on the site and Graham has moved up in the world.

So the past couple of meetings we've talked to you about the changes that are going on at the Ohio EPA and our expansion with regard to federal facilities, particularly with regard to the Fernald site and our team that we're creating to work on the Fernald site.

We've hired three new people to work on the site. Those people transferred out of another division within the agency to work on the Fernald site and they're here with me tonight. Tim Hall is here, and Kelly Kaletski, and Donna Bohannon. They're all back here.

Most of you may know Donna. She works on the -- worked in the past tense, with Patty Menarochi and she's going to be carrying over those duties for a short time while they assign someone else at the old division to work on that site, but from now on she will be working on the

Fernald site with us. Also with us here tonight it looks like Graham is here and Lora is back in the back flashing pictures all over the place.

The other thing I wanted to talk about is with these new people and our expanded capabilities we're going to be looking to reach out and make more commitments to you, and to keep the public involved in what's going on and be able to provide services to the public, you know, what information you need, if we can be more responsive or take action that will meet your needs we'll try to do those, so come to us with what you need and later on when we wrap this up feel free to introduce yourself to the new staff members working for us here.

Another administrative thing that's going on is that we just moved our district office in Dayton and that's caused a bit of confusion.

I'm without a phone. I now have a phone. I just ran a cord like 100 feet across the office to it, it's working out, so I have a temporary number.

Lora has a bunch of the new change of address sheets so if you want to know our new address and telephone numbers chase Lora write it



2.0

down and we'll get you a change of address sheet.

Now, onto the site specific stuff. I just want to talk to you about your role and public participation over the upcoming months. Jack talked to you about the decisions that have come up and Jim did too, and I want to re-emphasize that the decisions that are going to be made in the next six months or your ability to impact those decisions is going to be more than it's ever been on the site so far I think.

We're going to have the OU2 proposed plan that's going to be out for public comment in August -- OU1, I'm sorry, OU1 will be out in mid August that will talk about the waste pits and what we're going to do with that material, and you're all going to want to be involved in that.

And then come October, mid October, September time frame we're going to be looking at the OU2 proposal, between those 2 operable units we're going to be making some decisions with regard to waste disposal on this site and how much is going off site, so that's where your involvement is going to be paramount within these next few months.

So I just wanted to emphasize that and we'll keep pushing on you to let you know when those things are coming and we'll let you know when they are coming, maybe hold some availability sessions and stuff like that to try to keep you up-to-date with our views on the subject.

But I just wanted to re-emphasize the need for public participation at this stage of the game is real important. Thanks. If you have any questions we'll be around later.

MR. STEGNER: Okay, Tom. John Applegate, Fernald Citizens Task Force.

MR. APPLEGATE: Good evening,
thanks, Gary. Well, as we've talked about before
with the DOE the main thrust of the work of the
Fernald Citizens Task Force is not to look at every
document that comes out as it comes out, that's
FRESH's job and yours. You didn't know that, did
you, but --

MS. NONGASTER: I'm a pain.

MR. APPLEGATE: -- to look at the future use of the site and to use that kind of recommendation to make recommendations about other issues like how clean is clean. In the breakout

是"智慧"

sessions across the way on the strategic plan I certainly got an ear full of different ideas about future use of the site, clean up concerns.

is that we have collectively a lot of different ways of envisioning the site in the future, a lot of different ideas about how clean it should be.

Some of them were consistent with each other and some of them it's going to be hard to get them to work together.

The one thing I just wanted to report to you about is we have in the past couple of months, the task force and other groups including Fernald management, had a community meeting like this over at Meadowbrook, but have been doing this future use we kind of call it the game.

Those who -- some disapprove of the idea of thinking of it as a game because it's really deadly serious, but it's kind of a map of the site with poker chips on it elaborately painted by skilled professionals that represent concentrations and amounts of waste.

And what we've been trying to do is get some idea of what it physically means at the

site to remove waste, and what it costs, and what
that says about the future use. And from various
runnings of the game I guess we've gotten a number
of ideas that seem to be consistent that most
people seem to want to achieve, and some
differences.

- And what we're doing at this point and over the summer is to kind of distill those into two or three options and in variations of that or two or three scenarios in variations of that.
- And what we'll be spending the fall doing is trying to work those into a single hopefully consensus vision of the future use of the site, what that means for clean-up standards. It's a big job.
- and one of the things that's going to be most helpful is just to repeat the theme that you've heard again and again tonight which is public input. We've had as I said one general public meeting playing this game and before we are finished we will have at least one more, and hopefully more public meetings to get the input of the general public.

Also our meetings are open to the

7 7 7 5

public and let me encourage each and everyone of you to attend as many as possible. Our next meeting, we're spending the summer developing the information about some of these alternatives, our next meeting will be in September and we'll as usual make that information as available as possible, that's it. Thank you.

MR. STEGNER: Thanks, John. Does FRESH want to say anything?

MS. DASTILLUNG: First off, I have a couple of condolences that we have to express.

Lisa Crawford of FRESH isn't here because her mother-in-law passed away. And the other one is the family of Herb Kelly who also passed away. He was a member of FRESH and also worked at the plant and came to a lot of these types of meetings.

I asked Lisa what should I say for the comments. She said, well, the basic thing, and it's the same thing you're hearing from EPA, is the next few months or year or so is going to be really critical, and we have screamed for years we want public participation, we want more, we want more, and now they've given it to us. So now it's time for everybody to participate to the fullest so we

get the best results we possibly can on the cleanup of the site.

and one other thing that somebody was saying we need more time to express our ideas to DOE. The breakout sessions tonight were an idea that the DOE attempted because we had suggested that we were having so many other meetings taking up evenings and all that maybe we could have quick hits on a couple major topics at this meeting.

If the people would like to see more discussion on this topic if you would express that to the DOE I am sure that they would be more than willing to arrange for more roundtables on those topics. They've been very good about going the extra mile for us whenever we found we needed more discussion time. That's basically all I have to say.

MR. STEGNER: Thank you, Vicky. Now is the part where we'll open it up if anyone has any questions, comments, they want to make with us tonight. Yes, Norma.

MS. NONGASTER: I'm little, but I holler a lot. I just wanted to go over a few of the things that we had in the breakout sessions.



One that I think that should be reiterated and expressed very loudly is one that I made about DOE's commitment.

I would like to see them make a commitment from now on when they're talking about this waste, to be truthful about the half lifes on some of this material and how serious it is. And that's one way they can work with the public to let them know. And I think that would be able to help them get more funding and the public to be more behind them to get a good cleanup on these sites.

Another thing is I wanted to go back to we would like to see the copies of the overheads.

MR. SARIC: They're in the back.

MS. NONGASTER: Okay. Also we want to have the breakdown that we asked Ray Hansen for. And the missing material, oh, that's the other question, how much thorium is left, what types of waste have been shipped off-site? We would like to see a breakdown of that.

And then I also had a little question here, it's not the most important thing in my mind, but I really did not get an answer to this and

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

- 1 | maybe you can answer.
- A couple weeks ago in the paper they
- 3 | said Fernald had a problem with some missing
- 4 | material after Westinghouse left, was that
- 5 | computers?
- 6 It seems like I heard something about
- 7 computers and things were gone. I was just
- 8 | wondering what kind of equipment that was that was
- 9 missing.
- MR. STEGNER: I'm not exactly sure.
- 11 Does anyone here, who definitely knows?
- MS. DATILLUNG: There was a report
- 13 on TV that mentioned the fact that things from the
- 14 | site were gone, like millions of dollars worth of
- 15 things were gone and couldn't be accounted for, and
- 16 | so it was kind of like a question mark where did
- 17 | this stuff go.
- 18 MR. OFTE: I don't want to take away
- 19 any of your questions at all. But let me say that
- 20 when we first, when FERMCO, first came on board one
- 21 of the things that was done was to look over the
- 22 | list, that the DOE orders require that we inventory
- 23 anything that costs more than \$5,000 in the way of
- 24 | equipment.

And then below that level between \$500 and \$5,000 is what's called sensitive equipment, things that aren't easily moved around. And we want to make sure that we would tell the DOE what we were totally responsible for.

able to find what was on the books there was about \$2.3 million worth of items that we just could not find, and so we reported that to the Department of Energy because we wanted to be responsible for the material that was -- that we could identify that we were really responsible for, but we did not want to be held responsible for things that just weren't there, and I can't tell you what the mix is of the items.

MS. NONGASTER: It's not your fault. It's hard for me to understand how that happens, but I work at the University of Cincinnati and we list the equipment, it all has a little tag on it with a number, we have to list it.

And we have to account for that every year, and I understand, you know, we have problems at UC some of the professors took their computers home, you know, but we had lists for that and they

had to bring it back.

MR. OFTE:
professors in our midst?

MR. APPLEGATE: It never happened.

Is one of those

MS. NONGASTER: Now, my goody here

is one that I've hit on several times is on transportation issues. We're already in the transportation and we have been a couple of years.

It's good that you scheduled a workshop here in August, but I still find a problem with that. We need some kind of answers or some kind of improvement on it, particularly what, you know, happened back in November.

I finally found out through Cathy
Graham and some other people who were shipping that
stuff and it was -- what was it, ASI, out of
Oakridge was shipping stuff up to UC and it wasn't
properly packaged, and it violated DOE and
everything.

You've got big stuff going out of here now, not little samples. You've had thorium going for quite awhile. We need something on this almost immediately. It's traveling through our neighborhoods.

及紧紧器

MR. STEGNER: I understand.

MR. APPLEGATE: Just to respond to that the task force asked for a breakdown on a monthly basis of material that's being shipped onto and off-site, and that's available to anyone who wants it.

Gary, probably you're the best person to coordinate that, but anyone who wants it, it's a simple breakdown of the chart that identifies what the material is, how much of it, where it's going, and why.

MS. NONGASTER: Well, that's helpful, but my biggest questions are is what kind of safety they have, what kind of training do they have, and do these people know what's going through these communities, that's my question.

MR. STEGNER: Those are good questions.

MR. APPLEGATE: That would be a good starting point.

MR. STEGNER: That's something we're going to address at the workshop in August. In the interim period what I can do is ask someone to contact you about your specific questions and we'll

Spangler Reporting Services

do that, give you a point of contact. I think we're booked up next month, but maybe July.

that.

we also had a written comment. It's one on the strategic plan and the values, it suggests that we had creativity in the material release segment, how do we know down the road the release limits will be changed. Good question.

Good comment. And we'll get you an answer on

Are there any other questions or comments right now before we adjourn? Yes, Marvin.

MR. CLAWSON: I'm on the task force and we're playing that little game of course about the waste risk levels. And I've talked to a few people and we're talking about ten to the fourth, and ten to the fifth, and ten to the sixth, and I understand that the present technology is probably in the ten to the fourth area, and will it ever improve to the ten to the fifth and ten to the sixth?

I mean you can't verify, you know, you can have great visions, but if you can't verify ten to the fifth or ten to the sixth risk what do you do about that?

MR. STEGNER: That's also a very good question. I'm not sure anybody here is ready to respond to that on the spot, but again we'll put our staff onto that and arrive at some conclusion on that and get back to you on it again within 48 hours.

MR. BRETTSCHNEIDER: I'll take a shot at it. Okay. Marvin, I think what you're asking was the soil clean-up levels. I think at this stage ten minus six can be measured basically with a field instrument, that's what you're referring to.

Everything else we're literally going to have to go in, if we decide, you know, six inches of soil have to be removed or whatever, pull it out of there and then go back and take laboratory samples and go into the lab.

MR. CLAWSON: You say ten to the minus six can be measured with field instruments?

MR. BRETTSCHNEIDER: I'm sorry, ten to minus four can be measured with field instruments, but anything lower than that we will have to go in and clean it out clean and take the samples and take them to the laboratory where we

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

can measure to a lower level, so then if we don't get one we will have to go back out again.

And what we're looking for obviously one of the things is technology development and we're looking for equipment that we can literally go out and get a lower level. But if we can't do it we can verify it in the lab. The problem is you do so much work, measure it, and you may have to go back out and do some more.

MR. CLAWSON: Do you have any technology or is there any being developed where you can measure those levels with accuracy in the field rather than scoop it up and ship it off, and you know, that's time consuming?

MR. BRETTSCHNEIDER: Of course all the laboratory samples what we're basing the RI/FS on right now is samples we've collected and taken to the laboratory, so they are measured down to the ten to the minus six range at this point in time, so that's a big one.

So like I say, we're looking for, you know, obviously if we can find equipment assuming we do go to stricter levels than ten to the minus four obviously we would rather have

18

19

20

21

22

23

2 4

equipment that we can use in the field and do real time and let the monitor measure it, but it's not

MR. STEGNER: Go ahead, Vicky.

MS. DASTILLUNG: You have on the upcoming public visitation things June 28th workshop on the feasibity study of OU2, did I understand that the OU2 feasibility study is being rewritten? Will it be rewritten by then or what will be covered during that workshop?

I have not been told any different that it will not be ready. Do you

The format of the OU2 FS has to be rewritten. The pieces, the building blocks, will be the same that we have worked with and we'll be able to present on June 28th.

MS. DASTILLUNG: Okay. So the actual information isn't going to be changing that much?

MS. WEATHERUP: No, we are responding to a lot of the sessions that have been held in the last several months of looking at

Spangler Reporting Services

- different land uses for the site. And so we are adding some different combinations and adding some alternatives.
- We did bring that up on the RI

 presentation that was held about a month or so ago

 to talk about those and kind of sketched out what

 the volumes would look like and some of the costs.

 And we'll go into that in a little more detail and we'll tell you which ones haven't been finalized and which ones will be sent to the EPA in the next draft.
- MS. DASTILLUNG: We all get the same
- 13 | version?
- MS. WEATHERUP: Yes.
- MR. STEGNER: I saw another question
- 16 there.

MR. STORER: Gary, it seems that

about a year ago, it may have been longer, we had a

meeting -- you had another community meeting here

at the Plantation and there were three other

breakout sessions one of which addressed future use

of the plant, I believe that was right next door,

and I think maybe you were the moderator of that

group, I don't remember. I hope the turnover of

A. 200

the plant hasn't been so great that we're the only two here that remember that.

But nevertheless there was quite a bit -- quite a few tearoffs that were generated about possiblity of future use of the plant just as I see here this evening. I'm interested in what happened to those tearoffs. I would like to see those typed up and sent out either to the people that signed in here this evening or the question came up how to get people involved in the community.

Perhaps send these responses out to the community members just like I see many tearoffs here this evening that are difficult to read, and that's no fault of the people that wrote them, it's just that something that's difficult for us to get a feel for what's being written here since we weren't all in attendance at these different sessions.

It would be interesting to have these printed up --

MR. STEGNER: They will be.

MR. STORER: -- where the public can

at least read and see what some of the responses

Spangler Reporting Services

```
were. And I feel another positive aspect of this
that a resident maybe that's not here this
evening sees that their opinion was not expressed
perhaps then they will come out and express their
opinion.
```

7

8 /

9

10

11

12

13

20

21

22

23

I feel like many of the people in the community will stay home as long as they feel their opinions are being expressed. If they see their opinions are not expressed then perhaps they will come out and attend more of the meetings.

MR. STEGNER: I'm glad you brought that up because these will be transcribed and mailed to everyone here early next week.

MS. FOSTER: Now, Gary, we mailed those other ones.

MR. STEGNER: It's very important we have your name and address.

MS. FOSTER: And I have a copy of those.

MR. STEGNER: We'll get you copies of those, the last ones, too.

MR. HANSEN: Is there anybody else who didn't get a copy of those?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you

```
6886
```

publish that in the newspaper?

MR. STEGNER: It's hard to do that.

We can send that kind of stuff. We can put it in one of our own internal documents that we send out on our mailing list, but it's hard enough for us to get releases in the newspaper.

MS. DASTILLUNG: Could you have copies for the people that go out through the Envoy Program and talk to the different township trustees and stuff, maybe if we all get what we just heard tonight it's nice, but it doesn't generate any aside from the people that are here.

MR. STEGNER: Yes, yes, we can do that. That's a good thing to put that in the envoy packages. Jean we'll do that. Very good idea. Any more questions, comments? Thank you all for coming -- yes, Phil.

MR. HAMRIC: I appreciate you all coming out tonight. I know a lot of people are working, and tired, and you came any way. We got some valuable input from you, and in particular the session on the vision was good, the value was good, and we're going to give that stuff another scrub, so thank you very much, we appreciate it.

			49
1			577
2	PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED	D AT 9:15 P.M.	
3			
4	' .		
5			
6			
7			
. 8			
9			,
			•
10			
11			·
12		4.	
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
23			
24			·
			l

8 7 7 61

CERTIFICATE

I, CONNIE DUPPS, RPR, the undersigned, a notary public-court reporter, do hereby certify that at the time and place stated herein, I recorded in stenotypy and thereafter had transcribed with computer-aided transcription the within (49), forty-nine pages, and that the foregoing transcript of proceedings is a complete and accurate report of my said stenotypy notes.

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: CONNIE DUPPS, RPR

14 AUGUST 13, 1997. NOTARY PUBLIC-STATE OF OHIO

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342